UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2934
9 August 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 9 August 1990, at 11.25 a.m.

President:	Mr. MUNTEANU	(Romania)
Members:	Canada	Mr. KIRSCH
	China	Mr. LI Daoyu
	Colombia	Mrs. CASTAÑO
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Ms. RASI
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. RAZALI
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. LOZINSKY
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Crispin TICKELL
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Yemen	Mr. AL-ASHTAL
	Zaire	Mr. LUKABU KHABOUJI N'ZAJI

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

best copy available

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION BETWEEN IRAQ AND KUWAIT

LETTER DATED 2 AUGUST 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF KUWAIT TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21423)

LETTER DATED 2 AUGUST 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21424)

LETTER DATED 8 AUGUST 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVES OF BAHRAIN, KUWAIT, OMAN, QATAR, SAUDI ARABIA AND THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21470)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2932nd meeting, I invite the representatives of Iraq and Kuwait to take places at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Al-Anbari (Iraq) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Oman in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Al-Khussaiby (Oman) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the requests contained in a letter dated 8 August 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/21469) and a letter dated 8 August 1990 from the Permanent Representatives of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/21470).

Members of the Council have before them document S/21471, which contains the text of a draft resolution that has been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following other documents: S/21444, S/21445, S/21446, S/21448, S/21449, S/21450, S/21451, S/21452, S/21453, S/21454, S/21456, S/21457, S/21458, S/21460, S/21461, S/21462, S/21464, S/21465, S/21466, S/21467 and S/21468, which contain communications from Italy, Argentina, Paraguay, Egypt, Japan, Kuwait (two communications), the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Saint Kitts and Nevis (two communications), Maldives, Nicaragua, Ghana, Chile (two communications), Japan, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Uruguay, Cuba, Haiti and Oman, respectively.

Members of the Council have received photocopies of communications received from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, and from the Islamic Republic of Iran, which will be issued as documents of the Security Council under the symbols S/21472 and S/21473, respectively, at 0600 hours tomorrow.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution (S/21471) before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire

The PRESIDENT: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has therefore been adopted unanimously as resolution 662 (1990).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): We are pleased and gratified by the unanimous approval by the Council of resolution 662 (1990).

The United States does not recognize Iraq's outrageous and unlawful declaration that Kuwait is part of Iraq.

My Government, therefore, is eager to support the legitimate Government of Kuwait through the consensus resolution we have adopted which declares that any such charade is null and void and without legal effect. Iraq has repeatedly, over the last several days, shown its scorn for the international community and for the resolutions of this body. Iraq's declaration is further proof of its continuing threat to the world community and its disdain for international law. For our part, at the request of Governments in the region, the United States has increased its presence in the area. We are in the course of informing this Council officially by appropriate letter of our action taken under Article 51 of the Charter. As President Bush said yesterday, this is entirely defensive in purpose, to help protect Saudi Arabia, and is taken under Article 51 of the Charter and indeed in consistency with Article 41 and resolution 661 (1990).

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

As resolution 661 (1990) affirms, Article 51 applies in this case. The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the large military presence on the Saudi frontier create grave risks of further aggression in the area. This being the case, my Government and others are, at the request of Saudi Arabia, sending forces with which to deter further Iraqi aggression.

Why is this resolution necessary? It is necessary because Iraq is attempting to extinguish the sovereignty of a State Member of the United Nations. There is something repugnant, chilling and vaguely familiar about the statement issued yesterday by the Iraqi Revolutionary Command Council. We have heard that rhetoric before. It was used about the Rhineland, the Sudetenland, about the Polish corridor, about Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia and about the Marco Polo Bridge incident in China. It was used to divide and swallow up sovereign States, contrary to international law. The world community did not react. The result was global conflagration.

We believe the international community has learned this lesson well. We here will not and cannot let this happen again. We have finally learned the grim lesson of the 1930s which was succinctly articulated by a Soviet Foreign Minister of that era, Maxim Litvinov. He said, "Peace is indivisible". We agree.

My Government is heartened by the response from the world community to resolution 661 (1990) and we are confident that the procedures to implement it are well under way by the Member States and in the United Nations. Resolutions 660 (1990) and 661 (1990) should be used not only to contain this cancerous act of aggression but also to require Iraq to withdraw its forces immediately, unconditionally and totally.

The Council also again today calls for the restoration of the legitimate authority, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Kuwait.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

By this resolution the international community again reaffirms that this crisis is not a regional matter alone, that it threatens us all and that we have learned the lessons of history. We cannot allow sovereign States Members of the United Nations to be swallowed up. The United States stands ready to return to the Council as circumstances warrant to seek further Council action to implement resolution 660 (1990). We are gratified that the Council continues to work expeditiously and effectively in its efforts to deal with this crisis.

READEX FICHE

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): My statement will be very brief because the situation is, unfortunately, quite clear. On 2 August Iraq invaded Kuwait; a few days later it set up a government at its service. But despite the adoption as early as 2 August of resolution 660 (1990), demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraq, and despite the withdrawal announcement made a short time later by that country, the occupation has continued.

Yesterday Iraq took one more step by announcing the merger of Iraq and Kuwait. That is an extemely serious decision taken in violation of international law and the United Nations Charter. It calls for a total condemnation on our part, and it led us to support without reservation the resolution just adopted unanimously by the Council. My country will of course look with favour on subsequent decisions that will be taken to ensure the implementation of resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990) and 662 (1990).

Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): There is deep, continuing alarm and concern in the Soviet Union over the uninterrupted trend towards a rapid growth of confrontation in the Persian Gulf area, caused by the armed invasion of Kuwait by Iraq, and also by yesterday's announcement of the so-called merger of these two States, and by the deployment of United States naval and air forces in Saudi Arabia. This was mentioned in the statement made today by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

Despite the efforts of the international community - and that includes the Soviet Union - undertaken in the days following Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, Iraq not only has not withdrawn its forces from Kuwait but has actually declared its annexation.

(Mr. Lozinsky, USSR)

It is hard and bitter for us to talk this way about Iraq's latest actions. Iraq is a country with which we have long had friendly relations, and we should like to maintain that friendship, but in this situation we cannot take a position of silence, and still less can we go against our conscience.

The Soviet approach to this question of principle remains a firm one. The sovereignty, national independence and territorial integrity of the State of Kuwait must be fully restored and protected. The Soviet Union is against reliance on force and against unilateral decisions.

In our view, the surest, wisest way to act in conflict situations is to make collective efforts and to make full use of the machinery of the United Nations. What is taking place in the Persian Gulf at this time demonstrates with particular clarity how important it is to be prudent and circumspect in such situations and to reject actions which might pour more oil on the fire.

We wish to remind everyone once again that the Soviet Union is against reliance on force and against unilateral decisions. The experience of many years has proved that the surest and wisest way to act in conflict situations is through collective efforts, using to the full all the potential of the United Nations. Specifically, as pointed out in the statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, we favour having the Security Council now devote its attention to this extremely acute matter on a permanent basis. We are prepared to undertake consultations immediately in the Security Council's Military Staff Committee, which, under the Charter of the United Nations, can perform very important functions.

As we see it, the efforts of the Arab countries themselves could play a special role here in preventing the situation in the Persian Gulf from expanding into an even larger military conflict.

(Mr. Lozinsky, USSR)

We listened attentively to statements about holding an urgent meeting of the Heads of the Arab States at Cairo, and we hope that the results of that meeting will be an important factor in joint actions with regard to the situation centred around Kuwait.

The Soviet Union calls upon all who are directly involved in the dangerous confrontation unfolding in the Persian Gulf area to respect the will of the international community and to show a high sense of responsibility for the fate of the world.

Mr. KIRSCH (Canada): I shall be brief, as the resolution that we have just adopted unanimously is clear and needs little amplification.

As the resolution states, the Iraqi declaration of its annexation of Kuwait has no basis in law and is null and void. Canada does not recognize this purported annexation and continues to recognize the legitimate Government of Kuwait.

There can be no doubt that other recent actions of the Government of Iraq are also in complete disregard of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes among States.

The international community, through the Security Council, has condemned the Iraqi invasion and occupation of Kuwait. We have imposed sanctions on Iraq for failing to withdraw its troops immediately and unconditionally. The announcement yesterday that Iraq had annexed Kuwait was made in defiance of this international condemnation, is an act of exceptional gravity and cannot be tolerated.

My delegation therefore voted in favour of resolution 662 (1990). We call upon Iraq to comply immediately with operative paragraph 3 of that resolution by rescinding its actions purporting to annex Kuwait.

Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom): We have passed through eight extraordinary days. Who would have imagined that the Security Council would have been put to the test in the way that it has or that it would have responded so well in the form of the three resolutions: resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990) and 662 (1990). Confronted with the terrible events that have happened, my Government is delighted at the response to these amazing events, and we are particularly glad that the resolution we have just adopted should have been adopted unanimously. I shall not dwell upon that, but I should like to make one or two other brief comments.

I think that most of us, thinking about this crisis, have a terrible feeling that we are in a kind of time warp, that we are looking at one of those black and white films of the 1930s when the dictators strutted on the world stage and seized the territories of others, claiming anschluss, or whatever it might be, as if the world was not really looking. Now, we are caught in this time warp and looking at events which, I think, even 10 days ago would have seemed to most people almost incredible. But we have responded well, and I think it very important that we watch each stage of the crisis when we consider the events that are to follow.

The first is, of course, that we have been misled in a most lavish and dramatic fashion. We were told that Iraq had no intention of invading Kuwait; that was passed on privately and publicly to the world. The invasion then followed. We were told very recently that Iraq had every intention of withdrawing; a timetable submitted to the United Nations indicated that Iraqi forces would be withdrawing from 8 o'clock on Sunday morning. Now we are told that Iraq has no ambitions elsewhere in the region; I think we must regard any assertions of that kind with legitimate suspicion and doubt.

Members will remember also that we were told that a "provisional free Kuwait government" had been invented to conduct the affairs of that country. It was true that most members of that government were Iraqis, but nevertheless the government

(Sir Crispin Tickell, United Kingdom)

was formed and we saw television pictures of that government taking office. It is hardly necessary for me to say that that government was neither free nor Kuwaiti nor a government - but it was certainly provisional.

The Iraqi Government is now trying to invoke arguments to justify its actions by harking back to the time of the Ottoman sultans to demonstrate a right to engulf Kuwait. I would just remind the Council that on 4 October 1963 Iraq formally recognized Kuwait's sovereignty and independence. Iraq should stand by that undertaking now.

Even at this stage it is not too late for Iraq to implement Security Council resolution 660 (1990) and avoid the impact of the sanctions provided for in Security Council resolution 661 (1990). I reiterate that we must continue to support the efforts of the League of Arab States; it must be our profound hope that the current Arab summit in Cairo will bear fruit and point a way out of the crisis. But I must also make it clear that such a way out of the crisis must include the restoration of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Kuwait under its legitimate Government, and the withdrawal of all Iraqi forces unconditionally from Kuwait in accordance with Security Council resolution 660 (1990).

Members of the Council may wish to know that four orders to give effect to Security Council resolution 661 (1990) under British law in the United Kingdom and our dependent Territories, and as regards British nationals and companies overseas, entered into force at midnight last night. In short, we have now given legislative effect within our territories to the provisions of Security Council resolution 661 (1990).

Members of the Council will also know that at the request of the Government of Saudi Arabia my Government has agreed to contribute forces to a multinational

(Sir Crispin Tickell, United Kingdom)

effort for the collective defence of the territory of Saudi Arabia and other threatened States in the area. We will do so in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which members will recall was specifically reaffirmed in the preambule to Security Council resolution 661 (1990). The presence of British forces, particularly naval forces, in the area will be of added advantage in the context of securing the effective implementation of resolution 661 (1990). Paragraph 6 (b) of that resolution in particular called upon all States to provide further information regarding the action they had taken concerning the effective implementation of the provisions of that resolution. We see the close monitoring of maritime traffic as a key element in making the embargo effective. We shall, of course, give the new Security Council Committee, which is to meet for the first time this afternoon, the fullest collaboration, and will pass on the information thereby gathered as rapidly as possible for assessment and appropriate further action.

This, I think, is another important day in the history of this institution and sets a precedent for the kind of Security Council and the kind of functioning of the Security Council first envisaged by the founding fathers when they drew up those documents so long ago.

Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia): We are deeply aggrieved by the turn of events following Iraq's illegal annexation of Kuwait. It saddens us to note that Iraq has emerged as a new intenational pariah. It has violated the fundamental principles of the pacific resolution of disputes by launching naked aggression against Kuwait. It has defied the will of the international community, and certainly of this Council, that it immediately and unconditionally withdraw its forces from Kuwaiti territory.

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

What we are watching before our very eyes is an act of utter lawlessness, a sad re-enactment of the tragic events of the 1930s when might made right. We all recall where that led. This Council is determined to prevent a repetition.

This Council bears the supreme responsibility for the restoration of law, sanity and respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

We condemn in the strongest possible terms this latest attempt at the sudden and forcible obliteration of the State of Kuwait through the invasion by Iraq of the sovereign and peaceful State of Kuwait. It is incumbent upon us to stand firm and to strive to nullify that outrage, that utter defiance of the collective will of the Council and, indeed, of the entire international community.

It is with that conviction that Ethiopia, which itself was a victim of such aggression in the past, condemns Iraq's aggression and its annexation of Kuwait. Needless to say, my delegation is prepared to co-operate in all possible measures that may be envisaged to face up to the grave challenge posed to the preservation of international peace and security. We call upon Iraq to comply with Security Council resolution 660 (1990) and we reiterate our support for the full restoration of the unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Kuwait.

Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia): Malaysia is extremely disappointed and alarmed by the Iraqi action to annex Kuwait. The action was taken in the face of Security Council resolutions 660 (1990) and 661 (1990), raising very grave questions about the steps ahead. Malaysia upholds that every country, the weak as well as the powerful, must come within the parameters and strictures of United Nations principles. No principle is more important and more hallowed than the right of all nations to their sovereignty, national independence and territorial integrity.

The world has come a long way from the history of wars and miseries brought about as a result of ambitions and imperatives of States to expand and annex other States around them. There is now total rejection of such acts and policies. The Security Council this time and in this instance can do no less. The annexation of Kuwait is totally unacceptable. In rejecting the annexation of Kuwait, the Security Council will need to do so from the high ground that it represents as a collective international authority, and it must be prepared to take the necessary action to restore to Kuwait its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Malaysia would like to appeal to Iraq not to doubt the will and ability of the United Nations to bring the full weight of its power and influence to implement Security Council resolutions 660 (1990) and 661 (1990). The atmosphere at the moment is dangerously charged with ominous possibilities. The Arab countries at this moment are engaged in critical discussions at the highest level to determine a response that will move the situation away from the precipice towards which we are advancing.

We must all give the Arab countries all support, understanding and encouragement. We must all take several steps away from that precipice. The reaffirmation of the central role of the United Nations and the eschewing of unilateral actions will contribute to a move in that direction. No country

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

would wish to see a further deterioration of the situation and all would now appeal to Iraq to abide by Security Council resolutions 660 (1990) and 661 (1990) and heed the call of its Arab and Muslim brothers to end its occupation of Kuwait.

Mr. LI Daoyu (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation, like many other delegations, is shocked at the recent actions of Iraq. We wish to reiterate here that the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Kuwait must be restored and respected, that Security Council resolution 660 (1990) must be implemented immediately and effectively, and that Iraq should withdraw all its troops from Kuwait immediately and unconditionally. We believe that the annexation of a sovereign State constitutes a gross violation of the United Nations Charter and the basic norms governing international relations, and therefore cannot be allowed. Based on that position, we voted in favour of draft resolution S/21471.

In the meantime, we have noted with joy that an emergency Arab summit will be held today. We always support the mediation efforts of the Arab States and hope that the summit will yield positive results, so as to help reach a peaceful solution to the current dispute. We call upon all concerned parties to exercise restraint and refrain from taking any actions that might further complicate the situation, in order to restore peace and stability in the Gulf region.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I will be brief, since I have in fact no real need to explain my delegation's vote. My delegation, when it was first consulted about this situation and the draft resolution, confirmed that we would have no objection to voting in favour of the draft resolution, since we agreed that this decision should be taken at any appropriate time by the Council.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

However, I feel bound to make a number of comments, because I have heard rumours according to which someone, for some unknown reason, is seeking to disinform public opinion and the representatives of other States members of the Council concerning a supposed Cuban action to prevent or delay the adoption of the draft resolution. As members know, we indicated at informal consultations yesterday that we were ready to vote on it then and adopt it, as we were sure it would be adopted unanimously. What my delegation has in fact said in the consultations that we have been holding over the past few days since the adoption of Security Council resolution 661 (1990) is something quite different. We were saying it before the announcement of the annexation of Kuwait or even before the intention to do so was made public.

I feel duty bound to repeat what I have felt obliged to repeat constantly: our profound conviction that the Security Council and the international community must act energetically and promptly to prevent the conflict from becoming exacerbated and from spreading. We cannot ignore the obvious fact that certain Powers are taking unilateral measures that are not in accordance with the decisions taken by the Council, and that - as we noted at an earlier meeting - do not accord with the desire to maintain the sovereignty or territorial integrity of Kuwait or any other State. Such measures simply correspond to the hegemonistic designs of these Powers in the Middle East.

One cannot justify war and interventionism in the Middle East on the basis of any arbitrary interpretation of the right to self-defence.

The world did not come to an end with Mussolini, and the United Nations was born out of the ashes of fascism. And since the United Nations was born we have witnessed how certain great Powers have sought to use the Council more as a tool for their own strategic interests rather than as a body working for the maintenance of international peace and security.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

I am not going to make a long statement at this point. The last time I spoke before the Council, I called to mind that, not 50 or 60 years ago, but here and now the Council has failed to act on certain matters that affect us. My delegation will continue to insist that the Council must reject any unilateral or selected approach designed solely to benefit certain great Powers. I know that some delegations do not like names to be mentioned, but in this particular case I am talking especially about the United States of America.

Reference has been made, for example, to the importance of monitoring maritime transport routes so as to ensure that an economic and trade embargo is strictly applied. That is fine; my delegation is ready to wait until 17 August.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

I think we agreed that on 17 August we would hold the next meeting of the Committee of the Security Council - which was created not last week but exactly 13 years ago - entrusted with monitoring the implementation of the embargo against the South African régime, and this is not a trade embargo but an arms embargo.

A few weeks ago we saw a document from a prestigious non-governmental organization which indicated that more than one Member of the United Nations and of the Security Council was failing to comply strictly with the provisions of that embargo.

The idea has been mentioned of using the naval forces of certain States that have these means available, and are willing to provide them, to contribute to ensuring that the Committee on the South African arms embargo is able to work more effectively. We look forward to receiving proposals on these lines on 17 August.

But I think that I should call the attention of all members to the fact that it is not of benefit to the immense majority of mankind to accept the imposition, as a practice of our Organization, of these selective approaches based on the priorities of just certain quarters.

We think - and this is the only point that we have been stressing constantly in the past few days of private consultations - that we must act when all the media disclose and announce that there are some who are marching towards war, who are preparing for war; when calculations are made about the consequences this could have for their forces or military means. We think that it would be very irresponsible of the Security Council not to take this fact into account and not to act, and act immediately. This has nothing to do with the adoption of resolution 662 (1990), which we voted in favour of.

I would stress it is particularly important for us to keep in mind this serious and perturbing state of affairs in the Middle East region because, at the

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

same time, we have heard today news of something that we trust can open a door to hope and the solution of this deplorable conflict between Iraq and Kuwait and this serious situation prevailing in the region. I am referring to the summit meeting of the Arab States, which should be just getting under way in Cairo.

In this respect, I should like to quote the following from a message sent yesterday by President Fidel Castro to all the Heads of State of the Arab countries - a message that I had the honour of giving personally to Ambassador Abulhasan for transmission to his Government:

"... let me share with you, Sir, the certainty which inspires me of the wisdom and courage of the leaders of the Arab nation and the vitality of its institutions.

"Nothing and no one can replace this force, this authority and this morale in the immediate search for a negotiated solution to a conflict between two Arab peoples, one which entails, of course, the withdrawal of the Iraqi troops and the total restoration of Kuwait's sovereignty, without catastrophic wars, immolation of peoples and vast material destruction." (S/21465, p. 4)

My delegation expresses the hope that, given the concerted efforts of all the Arab States, they will be able to find a fair and swift solution to this conflict and thus shut the door in the face of today's and yesterday's imperialists, who are seeking to dominate the Middle East and treat it as if it were their own backyard.

Ms. RASI (Finland): The international community has been struck by the Iraqi declaration on the annexation of Kuwait. The adoption of Security Council resolutions 660 (1990) and 661 (1990) conveyed a very clear message of reason from the international community to Iraq. We regret that this message has not met with a responsible and serious reaction. Instead of serious intentions to withdraw and normalize the explosive situation, Iraq chooses expansion.

(Ms. Rasi, Finland)

The acquisition of the territory of another State by the use of force contradicts one of the most basic and firm principles of international law. Finland considers the annexation of Kuwait by Iraq null and void and has just joined other members of the Security Council in calling upon everyone not to recognize it.

We note with satisfaction that the Arab countries are sparing no effort to alleviate the extremely dangerous situation, and we look forward to positive results from the summit meeting convened to deal with the developments.

We once again appeal to Iraq and to all others concerned to exercise extreme restraint, in order not to accelerate the cycle of tension and escalate the situation.

The occupation of Kuwait by Iraq must be brought to an end. It would be an unforgivable mistake to repeat failures of history at a time when world developments present an opportunity to work for the better.

Mrs. CASTAÑO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): In the light of the events that have followed the adoption of Security Council resolutions 660 (1990) and 661 (1990), the delegation of Colombia expresses its profound concern at and its outright condemnation of Iraq's declaration that it is annexing Kuwait, in direct contravention of the fundamental principles of international law.

We lent our support to and co-sponsored resolutions 660 (1990) and 661 (1990), and the same is true of the resolution that the Council has just adopted. We did so because we believe that the Security Council must continue to play the leading and salient role it has played so far in the search for a peaceful solution to this conflict, which affects the world.

The use of force can never legitimize the occupation and subjugation of a Territory. Hence, we hope that all States and international organizations in the

(Mrs. Castaño, Colombia)

world will take the action required in order to nullify the annexation of Kuwait. The independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of Kuwait must be restored, and to that end we recognize the Security Council's competence. Thus, States must work together to ensure that tensions are not exacerbated or allowed to spread to other areas.

My delegation offers its co-operation in the work of the Security Council. We hope that the influence of the League of Arab States will help to bring about a peaceful solution to this dispute.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Romania.

Romania voted in favour of resolutions 660 (1990) and 661 (1990) on the item, "The situation between Iraq and Kuwait", and called for their immediate and unconditional implementation. It is in the same spirit, and in conformity with the same position, that Romania expresses its full support for the resolution that has just been adopted, contained in document S/21471. It is our firm stand that no reason can justify the use of force against an independent and sovereign State and the military occupation of that State. We are strongly of the view that resolutions 660 (1990) and 661 (1990) should be implemented promptly by all countries.

Romania again stands for the withdrawal without delay of the Iraqi military forces beyond the internationally recognized boundaries between the two countries and for the restoration of the legitimate Government of Kuwait. At the same time, we believe that all States should act in strict conformity with the universally accepted principles of international law. It is imperative for all States to display moderation and responsibility and to undertake nothing which may further aggravate the situation. Any new escalation of force would make the settlement of the situation, which is already particularly serious, even more difficult. What is necessary now is to resort to political actions and to keep dialogue always open.

The United Nations and its Member States should be able to exercise their influence on events to keep the crisis under control and to keep the problems created by the use of force and the military occupation of another State under control. The resolution contained in document S/21471 is crystal clear in that respect, emphasizing that the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq has no legal validity. It underlines the Council's determination to restore the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Kuwait.

(The President)

We express the hope that this new resolution as well as the previous ones will be fully observed and implemented by all the parties concerned.

I now resume my function as President of the Council.

I now call on the representative of Kuwait.

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): For the third time in a week the Council is meeting to discuss the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait, Iraq's occupation by brute force of all Kuwait's soil and the ramifications of that aggression. For the third time I am speaking in the Council while suffering and choking in pain, because the brother in whom we had put our full trust and the neighbour whom we have always treated well has acted in a manner that we least expected, a manner that has always been unacceptable under any norms or instruments: falsehood paraded in words and aggression paraded in actions.

The Council has met today to discuss the real motive for the aggression that started on 1 August. That motive has become clear to the world, as seen in the usurpation and total annexation of Kuwait by military force. This brings us back to the law of the jungle. It runs counter to all international norms, instruments and principles.

How could the aggressor so flout and disregard the international will, norms and practices governing relations between States and peoples? How did we get here? We got here through a series of lies and cheating that marked the Iraqi régime.

Before its invasion of Kuwait the Iraqi régime had made commitments to Arab leaders, greatly respected and appreciated by Kuwait and its people and equally respected by their peoples and by the world. They were commitments to the effect, as the Council well knows, that Iraq would not commit any act of aggression against Kuwait, let alone invade Kuwait. The result was that Iraq invaded Kuwait and occupied its soil in its entirety.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

The Iraqi régime then made another claim, that its invasion of Kuwait came at the request of alleged local parties. That claim was also proved false in a way that made it the subject of the mockery of all the peoples and countries of the world.

The Iraqi régime continued with its claims and promises. It promised to withdraw, and actually said that it had started withdrawing. Soon the substance of the Iraqi régime's true greedy desire became manifest - to swallow and annex the whole of Kuwaiti soil, advancing false claims that did not prevail in the past and will not prevail now, in our day. How, then, after today can we believe any promises, any commitments or any stated intentions of that outlaw régime, flouting international norms and instruments?

The Emir, Government and people of Kuwait, faced with this new challenge not only to us, but to all the other peoples of the world, call upon your Council, and through it the international community, to condemn and categorically reject this annexation, and to consider it null and void, with no legal validity.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

There is a clear principle deeply rooted in international instruments and norms, namely, the non-admissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. It is a principle that can, given its strength, face up to the tyranny of the Iraqi aggression, which has shown boundless hegemonistic intentions and threatens the peace and stability of the region.

The Council is called upon strictly to implement resolutions 660 (1990) and 661 (1990) so as to lead to Iraq's heeding the international will and withdraw all its forces and those who have illegally entered Kuwait and to the restoration of the situation to what it was prior to 1 August and the invasion. The Council is called upon also to support the efforts of the legitimate Government of Kuwait aimed at the reinstatement of its legitimate authority over the country's resources and the liberation of all Kuwaiti territory.

There is a genuine struggle being waged by the people of Kuwait under occupation, despite their limited resources. This struggle is a living expression of Kuwaiti rejection, whether by citizens or residents, to the tyranny of the occupier, to its aggression and to its presence on the soil of Kuwait. This struggle has grown recently because it is at the same time resisting the inhumane practices of the occupation forces, to which we drew the Council's attention in detail and which were clearly the subject of concern to all international mass media. The Council is called upon to support this genuine struggle and intervene, calling upon the occupying authority to cease immediately these inhumane practices. Our grave concern over the situation in Kuwait leads us to call upon the Council to make it absolutely clear to Iraq that it must respect the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilians in Time of War.

The resolution just unanimously adopted is, from our point of view in Kuwait, considered as a necessary reaction to the Iraqi claim, which is null and void, legally and in spirit, both as to procedure and result. We believe that this

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

resolution's provisions are within the framework of Chapter VII of the Charter. We look forward to the Council's continued support in implementation of resolutions 660, 661 and 662 (1990), thus upholding Kuwaiti legitimacy, the principles of the Charter and international norms and instruments.

In these critical moments in the life of peoples and nations, and in particular that of Kuwait, its Prince, its Government and its people, I find myself unable to suppress my feelings and those of all members of the Kuwaiti delegation. We are greatly impressed by the support and understanding we perceive in you, Mr. President, in the Secretary-General, in members of the Security Council, and in all delegations of States Members of the United Nations. From the very beginning of our tragedy, we have been overwhelmed by their sympathy, concern and understanding of the true meaning of this aggression, an aggression that would not limit itself to Kuwait's boundary. Its tyranny, blackmailing and terrorism would spread to include all States in the region and threaten peace in the world.

On behalf of my delegation, I wish to tell you, Mr. President, the Secretary-General the members of the Council and everyone here that you are standing on the side of right and are recording in the annals of history testimony of your firm respect for principles and your rejection of the senseless use of power devoid of right - something which cannot prevail and cannot govern the life of peoples and the destiny of humanity.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Kuwait for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Oman, who wishes to speak on behalf of the States members of the Gulf Co-operation Council. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. AL-KHUSSAIBY (Oman): On behalf of the Permanent Representatives of the Gulf Co-operation Council member States, I wish to express our appreciation to you, Mr. President, and to the other members of the Security Council for your relentless efforts in trying to find a solution to end the Iraqi invasion, occupation and, today, annexation of Kuwait.

The Gulf Co-operation Council's member countries issued a strong statement concerning this act of aggression against Kuwait. Furthermore, the international community heard several statements condemning the Iraqi aggression, including statements issued by the League of Arab States and the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

(Mr. Al-Khussaiby, Oman)

In the light of such act of aggression, the Security Council, under your leadership, Mr. President, correctly adopted Security Council resolution 660 (1990), calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces to the positions before 1 August 1990, and for the need for the peaceful settlement of all their differences.

The Council was then faced with the situation which is threatening international peace and security. The Gulf Co-operation Council countries fully support the role of the United Nations and the Security Council to bring about a peaceful solution between these two brotherly countries and continue to express their recognition of the legitimate Government of Kuwait, under the leadership of His Highness Sheikh Jaber al-Ahmed al-Sabah, the Amir of Kuwait.

In their extraordinary ministerial council meeting on 7 August 1990, the Gulf Co-operation Council countries issued another communiqué to reaffirm their support of the legitimate Government of Kuwait, as circulated in the official document.

Once again, the Gulf Co-operation Council countries reiterate their call to Iraq to withdraw its forces immediately and unconditionally, in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the Security Council.

As a result of Iraq's non-compliance with Security Council resolution 660 (1990), the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 661 (1990), which calls for relevant sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

Unfortunately, before seeing any positive results of all the collective efforts of the international community, we learned with dismay of the declaration issued by the High Revolutionary Council of Iraq, annexing Kuwait to Iraq. This represents an act of defiance against the wishes of the international community and is in total disregard of the Charter of the United Nations.

The Gulf Co-operation Council countries regret this action and do not recognize such annexation. They urge other countries not to recognize such

(Mr. Al-Khussaiby, Oman)

annexation of a sovereign State and a full-fledged Member of the United Nations that has enjoyed years of international recognition by all countries, including Iraq.

Here the international community was faced once again with another serious situation which justified the adoption of another Security Council resolution. It is to be hoped that the resolution adopted here this morning will send a clear message to the world that such a declaration of annexation of the legitimate and sovereign State of Kuwait is null and void and unacceptable.

In conclusion, I wish to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to you, Mr. President, the members of the Security Council, the Secretary-General, and the Members of the United Nations for their understanding, encouragement, tireless efforts and support.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Oman for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Iraq on whom I now call.

Mr. AL-ANBARI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones, especially at their neighbours' homes. Forty-five years ago, the United States of America dropped the atomic bomb on two Japanese cities, killing thousands of innocent people during the course of that operation.

Some weeks ago the Council met in Geneva, with the support of all its member States, to debate the protection of women and children in the occupied Arab territories resulting from Israel's actions. The American delegation, however, did not hesitate to exercise its veto to prevent the adoption of a resolution on the subject. It was not alone in this, because the delegations of other countries have also dealt with Security Council resolutions in the past without giving due consideration to the international legitimacy on which they make fine speeches.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

I refer to such matters but I nevertheless respect fully the Security Council and its members.

My Government officially stated that it would undertake the withdrawal from Kuwait of its forces on 5 August this year, and that withdrawal was begun. None the less, some international circles do not want this withdrawal to proceed peacefully. That is why they have brought serious pressure to bear on the international community diplomatically and by other means and issued threats against my country; and that has made it impossible for my country to complete the withdrawal in a serene climate.

The allegations that Iraq is acting against a brotherly Arab country are without foundation whatsoever. Iraq has denied those allegations at a very high level and repeated that it respects the territorial integrity of all neighbouring Arab States, including the brotherly country of Saudi Arabia. Nevertheless, military intervention in the region is, in fact, the factor for the instability there.

When the Security Council adopted resolution 661 (1990), we heard statements from some of its members that the imposition of economic sanctions should not be a pretext for unilateral military measures on the part of any State not involved in the matter. None the less, a member of the Security Council trampled upon that resolution and did undertake unilateral military measures, and that is the true factor for the instability in the region at the present time.

The Revolutionary Command Council in Iraq, which is the supreme authority of our country, adopted an important resolution, and I think that the best comment to be made on the resolution adopted by the Council today at this meeting is to quote some passages from that resolution. The Iraqi Revolutionary Command Council stated that the former colonizers had not left our region without first having undertaken certain tasks.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

"In the past, the Arab nation was one and indivisible. After independence was gained by the Arab States the many countries of the region were the result of foreign colonizers carving up the territory of the region. The colonizers re-drew the geopolitical map of the region in order to weaken the Arab States. That did indeed split the Arab nation and made it difficult for it to speak with a single voice. The colonizers succeeded in their undertaking: They transformed the Arab nation into 22 Arab countries, including the recently united Yemen.

"In that way a part of the region cherished by Iraq - Kuwait - was separated from Iraq. This was our country's area of strategic access. The colonizers did not hesitate to do in Iraq what they did in other countries of the region.

"That is why the Iraqi Revolutionary Command Council decided to restore to our country the portion taken away from it, thus re-establishing the eternal, indestructible unity of our country. This continues today to have value for us, as we in Iraq believe; we now have the territorial unity that has emerged from our decision."

My Government reaffirms that the unity of Iraq and Kuwait is indestructible.

(spoke in English)

It is an eternal and irreversible unity.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): I hesitate to make a statement, but just a minute ago we heard something so strange, so outrageous, so unusual that it requires comment. The statement from the representative of Iraq was built around the initial notion that somehow all of this was the fault of the United States, ignoring the fact that his own Government moved forces without provocation to swallow up a fellow Arab country - indeed, an Arab brother - on the one hand, and secondly that a nearby threatened country, Saudi Arabia, asked for assistance from the United States and other friends, which has now been provided under Article 51 of the Charter.

He then went on to describe the unilateral, forcible, indeed aggressive "reunification" of the Arab world under his President, somehow seeming to justify it, contrary to international law, the Charter and the position of the League of Arab States, the Gulf Co-operation Council and indeed everyone that I can think of sitting here or anywhere in the world who believes in right and in justice. The notion that Iraq can take unilateral action to accomplish some Arab objective which only its President perceives, of course, leads us to wonder where does it end? Does it end in Kuwait? Does it move on to Saudi Arabia? Does it move to Jordan? Or does it move beyond, to other countries? All this is aside from the fact that in this particular region, with respect to this particular problem, my Government has no historical connection except to promote and defend the freedom and independence of the countries in that area.

And one wonders how this new-found surge of aggressive interest in Arab reunification can possibly be squared with the action of his own Government, as we heard just a few minutes ago, in 1963 in recognizing the freedom, the independence, the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the State of Kuwait, which we have just, of course, reaffirmed here in the Council.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Kuwait has asked to speak, and I now call on him.

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): I apologize for making another statement, but feel I must respond to the representative of Iraq.

I was being extremely honest. This was made plain by the fact that the representative of Iraq agreed with me in his reference to the colonial presence in the region and to the way in which the Arab world was partitioned. His statement confirms my statement that Iraq's expansionist objectives would not stop at Kuwait's boundaries. We know the Iraqi leadership's promises; we have come to see where those promises have led.

The Council has heard an attempt to justify the recent attempt to annex Kuwait. The representative of Iraq follows that justification with a promise that the aggression will not reach other countries. In the light of what we have seen of the credibility of Iraqi promises and the philosophy behind the invasion and annexation of Kuwait - as made clear a moment ago by the representative of Iraq - I leave it to the Council to draw the proper conclusions about the extent of Iraqi aggression in the region.

The representative of Iraq said that the Iraqi Revolutionary Command Council was his country's highest authority. I would point out that the Iraqi Revolutionary Command Council is not the highest authority in the world. The best answer to the Iraqi delegation's alleged eternal unity is the answer the Security Council has spoken through its unanimous adoption of resolution 662 (1990). The international authority of the Security Council supersedes that of the Iraqi delegation's Revolutionary Command Council.

The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2935
13 August 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 13 August 1990, at 3.30 p.m.

President:	Mr. MUNTEANU	(Romania)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. YU Mengjia
	Colombia	Mrs. CASTAÑO
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Ms. RASI
	France	Mr. DELON
	Malaysia	Mr. KUSHAIRI
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BYKOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. RICHARDSON
	United States of America	Mr. WATSON
	Yemen	Mr. BASALAMAH
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

LETTER DATED 10 AUGUST 1990 FROM THE HEAD OF GOVERMENT OF THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (S/21486)

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

In a letter dated 10 August 1990 addressed to the Secretary-General, the Head of Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein submitted the application of his country for membership in the United Nations. That letter has been circulated in document S/21486. Under the provisions of rule 59 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, unless the Council decides otherwise applications for membership shall be referred by the President of the Council to the Committee on the Admission of New Members. Accordingly, unless I hear a proposal to the contrary, I shall refer the application of the Principality of Liechtenstein to the Committee on the Admission of New Members for examination and report.

The last sentence of rule 59 provides that the Committee shall report its conclusions to the Council not less than 35 days in advance of a regular session of the General Assembly. Moreover, the fourth paragraph of rule 60 stipulates that the Security Council should make its recommendation on the application not less than 25 days in advance of a regular session of the General Assembly following the receipt of the application, in order to ensure its consideration at the session.

In view of the fact that the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly is scheduled to convene on 18 September, and bearing in mind the time-limits, I propose that the Committee on the Admission of New Members meet tomorrow,

(The President)

14 August, at 10.30 a.m., in Conference Room 8 in order to examine the application of the Principality of Liechtenstein and prepare the Committee's report to the Council.

I further propose that the Security Council meet again tomorrow, at 3.30 p.m., to consider and take a decision on the report of the Committee.

As I hear no objection, it is so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.05 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2936
14 August 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 14 August 1990, at 4.30 p.m.

President:	Mr. MUNTEANU	(Romania)
Members:	Canada	Mr. KIRSCH
	China	Mr. YU Mengjia
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Ms. RASI
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. REDZUAN
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. LOZINSKY
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. RICHARDSON
	United States of America	Mr. WATSON
	Yemen	Mr. AL-ALFI
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 5 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN FOR ADMISSION TO MEMBERSHIP IN THE UNITED NATIONS (S/21506)

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the report of the Committee on the Admission of New Members concerning the application of the Principality of Liechtenstein for admission to membership in the United Nations. That report appears in document S/21506.

In paragraph 3 of the report, the Committee recommends to the Security Council the adoption of a draft resolution on the application for membership of the Principality of Liechtenstein. In accordance with the procedure followed on previous occasions, I propose that the Council should first proceed to the vote on the draft resolution and that those who wish to speak should do so thereafter. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that that procedure is acceptable to the members of the Council.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in paragraph 3 of the report (S/21506) of the Committee on the Admission of New Members concerning the application of the Principality of Liechtenstein for admission to membership in the United Nations.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire

The PRESIDENT: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has thus been adopted unanimously as resolution 663 (1990).

I wish to extend warm congratulations to the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein on having received the unanimous support of the Council for its application for membership in the Organization. I shall immediately convey this decision to the Secretary-General for transmission to the General Assembly in accordance with the provisions of rule 60 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom): My delegation was very glad to vote in favour of the draft resolution to recommend to the General Assembly that the Principality of Liechtenstein be admitted to membership of the United Nations. Liechtenstein already participates in several agencies of the United Nations. It plays a full part in the Council of Europe and an active and constructive role in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE). My Government has no doubt that Liechtenstein is fully capable of carrying out the obligations of Member States of the United Nations, as set out in the Charter, and gladly supports Liechtenstein's application.

Mr. WATSON (United States of America): The United States Government is pleased to support the application of the Principality of Liechtenstein to join the United Nations. The desire of Liechtenstein to join the United Nations as its 160th Member is a reflection of the strength of the international ideal and of the increasing value of international co-operation.

We shall welcome Liechtenstein to the United Nations. We look forward to its contribution to the work of the Organization and anticipate expanding our already warm relationship through further co-operation here in New York.

Mr. KIRSCH (Canada) (interpretation from French): My delegation was very pleased to vote in favour of the request for admission of the Principality of Liechtenstein to membership of the United Nations. Canada will be happy to welcome Liechtenstein to the General Assembly and we look forward to its participation in all the activities of the Organization.

We see in this request for admission further proof of the renewed vitality of the United Nations, and we hope to develop with Liechtenstein an ongoing dialogue on the many issues now before the United Nations as well as close co-operation in the months and years to come.

Mr. PEÑALOSA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): In the midst of the many problems the world has been facing in recent days, it is reassuring to be meeting on such a welcome occasion as this, when the Security Council has recommended to the General Assembly the admission of Liechtenstein as the 160th Member of the United Nations. In welcoming this recommendation regarding the Principality of Liechtenstein - a country small in size but great in terms of its democracy, its respect for human rights and its love for peace - the delegation of Colombia wishes to convey to that country our fraternal support in the carrying out of the tasks that lie before it.

Ms. RASI (Finland): It is always an important occasion when a State seeks membership in the United Nations. It is almost two decades since a European State became a Member. With the entry of Liechtenstein, very little of Europe will remain outside the Organization. Though the final decision on this matter - be it only a formality - will be taken by the General Assembly later on, let me use this opportunity to congratulate the representatives of the Principality of Liechtenstein on today's decision. The members of the Security Council have no doubt of Liechtenstein's will and ability to accept and fully carry out the obligations of the United Nations Charter. This gives great pleasure to my country, Finland, and we look forward to co-operating with the representatives of the Principality of Liechtenstein in various bodies of the Organization.

Mr. YU Mengjia (China) (interpretation from Chinese): We are very pleased to be here to consider the application of the Principality of Liechtenstein for membership in the United Nations. On 10 August 1990, in a letter to the Secretary-General, the Head of Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein submitted that country's application for membership of the United Nations and declared that his country would accept and discharge the obligations provided for under the United Nations Charter. The Chinese delegation is of the view that the

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

Principality of Liechtenstein is a peace-loving country and, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, meets the requirements for United Nations membership. Hence, my delegation will fully support Liechtenstein's application. We were therefore also in favour of the Security Council's recommending to the General Assembly that it admit Liechtenstein to membership of the United Nations.

In recent years the Principality of Liechtenstein has participated actively in international affairs and has developed its relations with other countries. We are confident that on becoming a Member Liechtenstein will work together with the other Members of the United Nations and make its own contribution to safeguarding international peace, security and justice and to realizing the purposes and principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

There has existed between China and Liechtenstein a relationship of friendship. Bilateral ties in the political, economic and cultural fields have grown steadily in recent years. We are convinced that Sino-Liechtenstein relations will continue to expand in future. We also look forward to the establishment of cordial relations and co-operation between our two Permanent Missions to the United Nations.

Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union supported the request by the Principality of Liechtenstein for admission to membership of the United Nations on the basis of our conviction that all States, large and small, can and should make their contribution to the process of strengthening security and expanding mutual understanding between peoples. In that connection, this universal Organization, the United Nations, enables us to act, combining the peace-loving potential of all Members.

The Principality of Liechtenstein is well known for its participation in, inter alia, building the common European home and its rich experience in working

(Mr. Lozinsky, USSR)

within the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. We are pleased at the positive decision just taken by the Security Council and we congratulate the Principality of Liechtenstein on that decision. We are certain that this new Member of the United Nations will make a positive contribution to the multifaceted work of the Organization. For our part, we are ready to co-operate with it in all spheres.

Mr. REDZUAN (Malaysia): Malaysia fully supported the application of the Principality of Liechtenstein for membership in the United Nations. My Government stands ready to lend its full co-operation to Liechtenstein and looks forward to working with it in this Organization for the betterment of the international community. Malaysia has always maintained that this Organization plays a central role in the maintenance of international peace and security and in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural and humanitarian character. My delegation is confident that Liechtenstein will make a positive contribution to the multifaceted activities of the United Nations. We wish Liechtenstein all success.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): Welcoming a new Member to the United Nations is always a happy occasion bearing witness to the Organization's distinguished place in international life. Accordingly, the French Government supports the admission of Liechtenstein to the United Nations and is pleased that the Council unanimously adopted the draft resolution before it.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): It was a pleasure for my delegation to support the application of the Principality of Liechtenstein for admission to membership of the United Nations. We believe that this new Member of the United Nations will promote the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. We look forward to further co-operation with the Principality of Liechtenstein in the service of those purposes and principles.

Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia): My delegation was very happy to join in the Council's unanimous recommendation that Liechtenstein be admitted to membership of the United Nations. We did so in the conviction that the Principality of Liechtenstein will contribute to strengthening the United Nations and we look forward to co-operating with the new Member as well as to its heightened contribution to the work of the international Organization.

I shall be pleased to welcome the Principality of Liechtenstein to membership of our Organization.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of Romania.

It is a matter of great satisfaction that after days and nights of complex debates and consultations on a highly political issue the Security Council is now dealing with a positive, promising and gratifying event such as the admission of a new Member State to the United Nations.

Romania pledges its full support for the application for membership in the United Nations submitted by Liechtenstein, and voted for it. We are particularly happy to welcome to the world Organization a European State of the area to which my own country belongs, which will offer Romania and Liechtenstein many auspicious occasions to develop and diversify their ties of friendship and co-operation, which are based on a long tradition of sympathy and mutual respect.

In welcoming Liechtenstein to the United Nations, Romania is aware of its potential contribution both at the regional European level and at the universal level, in keeping with the noble objectives laid down in the Charter of the United Nations.

We are pleased to see that Liechtenstein participates actively and regularly in the CSCE follow-up process as well as in various specialized agencies of the United Nations as a partner in multilateral co-operation which enjoys the high esteem of all States.

I should like to place it on record that I am particularly pleased and honoured to have been so closely associated in the accomplishment of this happy event. The recommendation we have adopted is the culmination of the diplomatic efforts and achievements of Liechtenstein in the international arena and a powerful acknowledgement of its genuine dedication to the humanistic ideals of peace, friendship and general understanding.

(The President)

The maintenance of peace requires that the United Nations be universal in membership and in the scope of its activities and programmes. In this regard the admission of Liechtenstein will reconfirm one of the basic ideals and natural vocations of the United Nations, namely its universality. Liechtenstein will become the 160th Member of the world Organization, thus bringing the United Nations nearer its full quantitative universality. Moreover, by its valuable contribution as a peace-loving country to the settlement of the global and arduous problems of humankind and to the development of the multifaceted activities of the United Nations, Liechtenstein will also help to strengthen the qualitative dimension of the universality of our Organization. Indeed if all nations large and small are moved by common universal values, our world will be a safer place for present and future generations. The admission of Liechtenstein to the United Nations is a historic event which emphasizes in our collective memory the permanent topicality of the imperative need to support the United Nations as the best instrument yet devised for keeping peace, building nations and protecting their dignity and aspirations.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

There are no further speakers for this meeting. The Council has thus concluded its consideration of the matter before it.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2937
18 August 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Saturday, 18 August 1990, at 10.45 p.m.

President:	Mr. MUNTEANU	(Romania)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. YU Mengjia
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. HAGOSS
	Finland	Ms. RASI
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. REDZUAN
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. LOZINSKY
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Crispin TICKELL
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Yemen	Mr. AL-ASHTAL
	Zaire	Mr. KIBIDI NGOVUKA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION BETWEEN IRAQ AND KUWAIT

LETTER DATED 2 AUGUST 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF KUWAIT TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21423)

LETTER DATED 2 AUGUST 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21424)

LETTER DATED 8 AUGUST 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVES OF BAHRAIN, KUWAIT, OMAN, QATAR, SAUDI ARABIA AND THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21470)

LETTER DATED 18 AUGUST 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ITALY TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21561)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2932nd meeting, I invite the representatives of Iraq and Kuwait to take places at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Al-Anbari (Iraq) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Al-Sallal (Kuwait) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Italy in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Traxler (Italy) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the request contained in a letter dated 18 August 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Italy to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/21561).

Members of the Council have before them document S/21562, which contains the text of a draft resolution which has been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/21548, which contains a letter dated 16 August 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call upon those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): The delegation of the Republic of Yemen will vote in favour of the draft resolution before us. However, we should like to make it clear that the vote of the Republic of Yemen on draft resolution S/21562 reflects our interest in the safety, security and well-being of all third-State nationals in Iraq and Kuwait. This interest is in keeping with humanitarian concerns and relates to all third-State nationals without exception, including Arab nationals.

Secondly, on the basis of the same humanitarian principles, we also affirm that we intend to safeguard the security and well-being of our brothers and sisters

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

in Iraq and Kuwait, in particular children, women and the elderly who may be affected by famine and illness due to the embargo on foodstuffs that has been imposed upon Iraq and Kuwait.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

It is for these humanitarian reasons that we call for the lifting of the embargo on food, a measure that should provide a serious index that would lead to the reduction of tension and military confrontation in the region.

Thirdly, the crisis in the region is far more deep-seated and dangerous than some believe. Moreover, it is becoming increasingly complicated because of the military and economic blockade that is being set up by one country against Iraq and Kuwait under Article 51 of the Charter. We believe that utilization of this military blockade by one State without taking into consideration the role assumed by the Security Council for the safeguarding of international peace and security is an act that is not defensive in character.

Fourthly, within this context the Republic of Yemen believes that an increase in the foreign military presence and its growing intensity in the region, a region that is near our own territorial waters and territory, is one that is not in any way in accordance with the political objectives cited as a pretext for sending foreign armed forces to the region. Moreover, it exceeds the estimates that were made for that massive presence. No one can doubt that some Powers, or indeed the same Powers that have sent the aforementioned forces, have asserted that they will remain in the region for a long time.

Fifthly, since the outbreak of the crisis the Republic of Yemen has called for a peaceful solution within an Arab context. Thus, my country has made efforts in the past and will continue doing so in future with a view to extricating ourselves from this crisis and finding political and diplomatic solutions to it.

On the basis of the said principle, we welcomed the Iraqi initiative because we saw in it an indication that Iraq wishes to settle this crisis by peaceful means. We still consider it necessary to seize this initiative so as to follow up the actions taken, with a view to reaching a peaceful settlement of all problems

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

confronting our region, because we are convinced of the interdependence of all problems in the region, and it is necessary not to lose sight of the general context of our problems in the Middle East, in particular the Israeli policy of expansion and settlement that has been continued in Palestinian territory, in the Golan Heights and in southern Lebanon.

Yemeni leaders, in their contacts and efforts to reach a solution to these problems in the region, are working towards developing that Iraqi initiative so that it will indeed provide a good basis making it possible to arrive at a political solution that will guarantee the peace, security, stability and well-being of the peoples and States of the region and also guarantee a balance of local, region and international interests in that region.

We consider this an excellent opportunity for the Security Council to invite all parties concerned to evince moderation and use all options existing for reaching a political solution in order to ensure that our region will not be confronted with a war whose scope would be tremendous and indeed terribly grave for our region.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/21562.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire

The PRESIDENT: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 664 (1990).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): At the outset, let me express the gratification of my Government at the unanimous adoption of this very important resolution.

Yesterday this Council expressed its concern and anxiety over the situation regarding foreign nationals in Iraq and Kuwait. In the succeeding 24 hours the Iraqi régime answered the deep and unanimous concern of the Security Council with new actions and threats against those innocent people, which we find dismaying and revolting.

In the mean time, the Secretary-General has moved swiftly. We warmly welcome his announcement that he will immediately send a special mission to the area.

Following our meeting yesterday, Baghdad continued to deny consular access to American and other nationals in Kuwait and in Iraq. Just a few hours later, Iraq crossed the Rubicon when the speaker of the Iraqi Parliament announced that foreign nationals were being detained and sent to camps and other housing, either inside or close to military and other strategic installations in Iraq.

As if that were not enough, we heard this morning that Iraq was also going to take special action against the weakest and most innocent of this group of foreign visitors and residents in Iraq and Kuwait. The régime of Saddam Hussein singled out infants for special food restrictions. It also pointed to the aged and their special needs and indicated that they would be denied food. The announcement did not distinguish between foreigners. It made it clear that all foreigners in those categories would be treated alike.

Finally, the announcement completely ignored the major concern of the Security Council that those foreign nationals who wish to leave Iraq and Kuwait should be permitted to do so. Obviously, instead of talk about the mutual sharing of food shortages under sanctions, such persons should be permitted to leave Iraq and Kuwait immediately, as is their right under international law and in accordance

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

with all common standards of human decency. Instead, we were told that they are being placed in the most sensitive areas, militarily speaking, of Iraq and Kuwait. The lesson is obvious: blatant Iraqi rejection of the concern and appeal of the Council is clear. That is why we are back, meeting here again today.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

This adds one more serious insult and injury to the many which the Iraqi régime has already heaped upon the family of nations:

It attacked without provocation a State Member of the United Nations.

It then, contrary to its own protestations, baldly annexed the territory of that State.

It has attempted in all possible ways to flout the Security Council resolution calling for immediate and unconditional withdrawal of its forces.

It has attempted to find all possible means to escape the sanctions imposed upon it under Security Council resolution 661 (1990).

It has continued in other ways flagrantly to violate international law and its obligations with respect to its treatment of the third-State citizen community in Iraq and Kuwait, including an order to shut down embassies and consulates in Kuwait and withdraw the diplomatic immunities of their personnel.

It has rejected the international community's condemnation of its invasion and aggression.

And now it has begun to round up and concentrate in Kuwait the innocent citizens of the United States and other countries friendly to the United States. It has begun also to relocate the civilian citizens of third countries, obviously separating them from the protection of their Governments, and is planning to use them as human shields around military and strategic installations in Iraq and Kuwait.

Each of the above actions is unacceptable to the international community. The cumulative effect of all these actions is intolerable. No nation can allow such steps to be taken against its own citizens without the fullest possible response. This is an action on the part of Iraq which requires the full and concerted solidarity of all States. This Council is the place where that action can and must be taken.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

In that regard, the Security Council's resolution will send an unequivocal and clear message to Saddam Hussein. He and his régime must bear the responsibility for the health, security and safety of third country citizens now locked up in his country. He must bear full responsibility before the family of nations and international public opinion for his treatment of those human beings. It is contrary to international law and to all the norms of Arab hospitality to use guests as military shields. Both the civil rights and the human rights of these individuals are clearly being violated, and we believe that the international community should speak out clearly, with one voice - and now - about the problem.

Throughout this crisis the international community, as represented here in this Council, has remained united in its resolve. Now it is time to continue to show that resolve. It is imperative, in the view of my Government, that the Security Council should record clearly and forcefully that Iraq has solemn obligations under the Charter of the United Nations which it must respect. We must call a spade a spade. When Iraq tears up international law, seeks to use innocent civilians as a military shield and indicates that it no longer respects its solemn obligations under the Charter and international law, we must speak clearly, firmly and forcefully, as we have.

In particular, we can do no less today because the lives of hundreds of thousands of foreign nationals from countries all over the world are being put at risk. We must move now to put on the record our clear efforts to secure their release. The resolution the Council has just adopted is a solid document. It calls on Iraq immediately to permit such persons to depart from Iraq and Kuwait, and it rejects fully and completely the efforts of Iraq to close the diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait which help to protect those people.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

Each of us has a duty and an obligation to protect our own citizens. Today we make it clear that it is not only our individual but our collective determination to do all we can to protect the lives, the safety, the security and the health of innocent citizens now caught up in this malign conspiracy of aggression and prevarication. My delegation worked hard to help prepare the resolution just adopted by the Security Council; we supported its adoption and will support its full implementation.

Mr. YU Mengjia (China) (interpretation from Chinese): We wish to express our sympathy with respect to the plight of foreign nationals in Iraq and Kuwait. Their safety and security should be guaranteed, and they should not be harmed in any way.

In its handling of this matter, the country concerned should abide by the principles of international law to guarantee the safety and security of all foreign nationals in Iraq and Kuwait and to guarantee their safe exit from those two countries if that is their choice.

On the basis of that position, we voted in favour of the draft resolution before the Council this evening. In that connection, we wish to convey our appreciation to the Secretary-General for his prompt response to the request by Council members to appoint representatives to engage in activities of good offices.

We believe that to solve the present serious crisis in the Gulf, it is necessary to implement the three relevant resolutions of the Security Council in a serious and effective manner. The occupying forces should immediately, unconditionally and completely withdraw from Kuwait. We support all efforts aimed at seeking a political settlement by peaceful means.

We are deeply disturbed by the mounting tension in the Gulf region. It is our belief that military involvement by the great Powers is not conducive to the settlement of the present crisis.

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

We appeal once again to the parties concerned to exercise restraint, so as to avoid any action that could cause a further deterioration of the situation.

Lastly, I wish to point out that this meeting is focused on the consideration of the situation of foreign nationals in Iraq and Kuwait rather than on the crisis as a whole. We therefore express reservations about the reference in the resolution to Chapter VII of the Charter, which has broader implications.

Mr. FORTIER (Canada): The situation faced by the nationals of third countries in Iraq and Kuwait is totally unacceptable. It is in clear and flagrant violation of the norms of international law, in particular of the Covenant on Civil and Poltical Rights and of the Fourth Geneva Convention, to both of which Iraq is a party. The Iraqi authorities have consistently and repeatedly chosen to ignore the démarches made by many Member States on behalf of their nationals, and it is for that reason that this body has responded quickly, clearly and unanimously to the plight of those many individuals.

As a result, Canada fully supports the text of the resolution we have just adopted, which demands that the Iraqi authorities should live up to their acknowledged responsibilities under international law and permit and facilitate the immediate departure from Kuwait and Iraq of the nationals of third countries. On this occasion I also wish to reiterate Canada's full and unqualified support for Security Council resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990) and 662 (1990). In particular, resolution 662 (1990) declared the annexation of Kuwait by Iraq to be null and void. As a consequence, we cannot accept the Iraqi Government's decision that diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait must be closed and that the personnel of those missions will lose their immunity.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

Hundreds of Canadians remain unable to leave either Iraq or Kuwait. They went to Iraq and Kuwait in good faith to contribute to the development of those countries. Their situation is causing the greatest distress to their families and their loved ones, and all Canadians profoundly sympathize with them, as well as with the citizens of all countries whose nationals remain in Kuwait or Iraq against their will.

(spoke in French)

This humanitarian crisis must not continue. Our Council has now unanimously condemned these contraventions by Iraq of its most elementary obligations under international humanitarian law, as it had to do. Canada welcomes all efforts, in particular those of the Secretary-General, to enable those third-country nationals who wish to do so to leave Iraq and Kuwait without delay.

Ms. RASI (Finland): We are all aware of the prolonged diplomatic efforts of numerous countries regarding the situation of foreigners in the territories of Iraq and Kuwait. Finland itself has used and continues to use all available diplomatic channels to secure the safe exit of Finnish citizens from those two countries. Regrettably, our efforts, like the efforts of many others, have so far been of little avail. We trust that there is no immediate threat to foreigners residing in Iraq and occupied Kuwait. However, the situation is a cause of ever more serious concern to us. Prohibiting foreigners to leave is in flagrant violation of international norms generally accepted and specifically undertaken by Iraq itself.

We expect Iraq to comply promptly with its international legal obligations and permit the departure of all foreigners who wish to leave. We also expect Iraq not to interfere in the status and functioning of diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait.

(Ms. Rasi, Finland)

Finland voted in favour of the humanitarian resolution under consideration in order to urge Iraq in the strongest possible terms to refrain from any action that might endanger the safety and health of foreigners and to guarantee their departure and other rights, in accordance with the norms of international law.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): France has approached the Iraqi authorities in a series of démarches in order to ensure that French citizens who so wish might freely leave Iraq and Kuwait, in accordance with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and in accordance with the Geneva Conventions, to which Iraq is a party. International law requires Iraq not only to protect foreign citizens within its territory but also to guarantee their freedom of movement.

Similar démarches have been made by other countries or groups of countries, as well as by the International Committee of the Red Cross. The only response of the Iraqi Government has been a succession of statements announcing ever more draconian measures against foreign nationals, whose freedom has today very clearly been trampled, in a discriminatory manner according to their nationalities.

Such methods, today accompanied by threats, elicit the greatest possible indignation on the part of France, not only because they violate international commitments, to which Iraq has subscribed, but also because they evidence deliberate scorn for the most fundamental humanitarian considerations.

My Government has explicitly instructed me to state that it denounces in the firmest possible way the unacceptable conduct of Iraq against foreign nationals detained in Iraq and Kuwait.

The Iraqi Ambassador in France was called this morning to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which told him to warn his authorities about the serious

(Mr. Blanc, France)

consequences which would surely result from any failure to ensure the safety of French nationals. That is why France fully supported the resolution just adopted, and we are very pleased that it was adopted unanimously.

Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation supported the draft resolution on the need for ensuring the safety of foreign nationals in Iraq and Kuwait, since we cannot fail to share the concern at the situation in which nationals of numerous countries find themselves, having become involved in the present situation, the beginning of which, as we all know, resulted from the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq.

Yesterday the members of the Security Council, through the President of the Council, expressed their concern at the fate of the foreign nationals there and requested the Secretary-General to take all necessary steps to resolve the matter. However, the situation continues to deteriorate. The Soviet delegation is convinced that it is necessary to continue efforts to find an early solution to the problem, in accordance with the principles of humanitarianism and respect for human rights, on the basis of the norms of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

In that connection, we should like to express our special hope for the success of the efforts of the Secretary-General and his representatives. Of course, everything possible will continue to be done by the Soviet Union as well, and, as we understand it, by other members of the international community, in order to bring about a successful settlement of the matter.

At the same time, one cannot help seeing that what is at issue is not only the safety of thousands of people and their freedom to leave those countries, but also the possibility that events might develop in such a way as to lead to a new escalation of tension there with unforeseeable consequences. In this situation it

(Mr. Lozinsky, USSR)

is important to stop military activities, to prevent them from spreading to other countries and to restore respect for international law.

As was emphasized by President Gorbachev of the Soviet Union, we are relying on the reasonableness and responsibility of Arab States and their regional organization and on the rights and powers of the United Nations and the Security Council, and we intend to act exclusively within the context of collective efforts for a settlement of this conflict. We would like to see political methods employed to prevent a military confrontation involving even greater dangers.

Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom): I think the resolution has said it all, and speakers so far have put with eloquence the main points and arguments which are to buttress it, but I feel that today in approaching this problem we must continue always to keep the essentials in mind. There was an unprovoked invasion of a brother-Arab State. There was the creation of a bogus Government of laughable implausibility. There was the rapid extinction of that Government. There was the annexation of that brother-Arab State. Meanwhile, that State knew loss of life. It has known destruction. It has seen its wealth removed to the aggressor capital. It has seen threats to its neighbours.

Against that background, we are today dealing with a strictly humanitarian problem.

Yesterday, members of the Council gathered and they asked you, Mr. President, to express their concern and anxiety about the foreign nationals caught in Kuwait to the Secretary-General and also to the Permanent Representative of Iraq. That was done and we know that the Secretary-General, who has this problem very much on his agenda, has already decided to send two emissaries to the Government of Iraq to secure the release of those who are caught in Iraq and Kuwait.

That was the situation yesterday. Since then there have been two acts which outrage international law and international opinion. The first was the use of innocent civilians, justified by nauseating rhetoric about their status as "guests", to act as a human shield to protect strategic sites. The second was the punishment of the hundreds of thousands of civilians caught in Kuwait and Iraq - a sort of act of retaliation against the Security Council for having adopted resolution 661 (1990) imposing economic sanctions upon Iraq.

Whom did they choose to retaliate against? They chose the weakest members of the community: the children, the women, the sick, the old and anyone who was sufficiently foreign to be blamed and caught up in the chariot wheels of history.

(Sir Crispin Tickell, United Kingdom)

I can hardly think of a more outrageous act that any of us in any generation has seen than that which is now taking place at the hands of the Iraqi Government.

We had hoped for an Arab solution to what has often been called an Arab problem. We saw particular attention given to the role of the League of Arab States in resolution 660 (1990), and I think we still must have a few lingering hopes. We have also heard some very sensible remarks about the wider dangers which are taking place in the region, and we have heard appeals for negotiation.

Any sensible person wants a peaceful solution, but I think that before closing I should remind this Council of what the basis of any such negotiations should be. It is set out in the recent acts of this Council:

> "... that Iraq withdraw immediately and unconditionally all its forces to the positions in which they were located on 1 August 1990." (resolution 660 (1990), para. 2)

and

> "... that annexation of Kuwait by Iraq under any form and whatever pretext has no legal validity, and is considered null and void" (resolution 662 (1990), para. 1).

In dealing with this humanitarian problem let us never lose our grip on its essentials, and let us keep that grip until this problem is resolved.

Mr. HAGOSS (Ethiopia): As the statements made by the previous speakers clearly indicate, these are difficult moments. Given the alarming situation in which third-country nationals find themselves in Iraq and Kuwait, and in view of the escalating tension in the Gulf as a whole, we consider it timely and appropriate that the Council has seen fit to adopt the resolution before us. Indeed, the attitude manifested by Iraq as regards foreign nationals, particularly

(Mr. Hagoss, Ethiopia)

as of this morning, clearly warrants a timely decision on the part of the Security Council.

There is no doubt that the foreign nationals trapped in Iraq and Kuwait are in need of the Council's support and protection. Ethiopia believes that the adoption of this resolution constitutes the collective response of the international community to the alarming broadcast that emanated from Baghdad pertaining to the predicament of third-country nationals.

Although Iraq's response to the Security Council's recent decisions has not been encouraging thus far, we should like to express our hope that Iraq would comply with the request contained in operative paragraph 1 of the resolution we have just adopted.

Mr. RADZUAN (Malaysia): My delegation shares the deep concern of the Council over the deteriorating situation with regard to the status of foreign nationals in Kuwait and Iraq. Malaysia regrets that thousands of foreign nationals in both countries are now under the threat of further danger to their safety and security. This situation is clearly in contravention of the principles of international law. Under the circumstances we believe that all foreign nationals should be allowed to leave Kuwait and Iraq and proper facilities should be provided for them to do so. These foreign nationals should be able to maintain contact with and receive the assistance of their consular representatives.

My delegation would also like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for his prompt response to your message, Mr. President, on behalf of the Council yesterday. We support the initiative taken by the Secretary-General to send his special emissaries immediately to Baghdad to address this humanitarian problem. At the same time, we believe it appropriate, in the light of the alarming deterioration in the situation today, that the Council has adopted this resolution unanimously.

(Mr. Radzuan, Malaysia)

In the interest of peace Malaysia hopes that the Government of Iraq will respond positively to this resolution, as well as to resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990) and 662 (1990), so that we can have an early and peaceful settlement to this unfortunate crisis.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The Security Council has voted in favour of resolution 664 (1990). Bearing in mind the views expressed by some members of our Council and Organization, to the effect that the resolution is based on exclusively humanitarian considerations, Cuba voted in favour of it. My delegation naturally shares the concerns for the fate of any innocent civilian involved in the conflict.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

We believe that it is legitimate to express this concern in regard to certain nationals of other countries who are currently on Iraqi and Kuwaiti territory. But we believe also that if there is a legitimate humanitarian concern, it should apply equally to the nationals of Iraq and Kuwait.

In the light of those considerations, we voted in favour of the draft resolution. We are concerned about the situation of innocent people involved in any conflict. We are concerned about improper treatment being meted out to the nationals of one or another country. We share this concern, which has been expressed by mankind on other occasions. It is not a new concern.

Indeed, not long ago in this country we were reminded of what had been done to persons of Japanese origin, who were interned in concentration camps merely because of their national origin and because the United States was involved in a war with Japan. We remember that much more recently severe limitations were placed on the possibility of diplomats leaving Panama, and, what is more, tanks, heavy artillery and major military concentrations were used to impede their leaving their diplomatic missions and even their moving from one embassy to another. Although the situation was particularly grievous with regard to the diplomats of my country, we cannot complain of discrimination since similar treatment was meted out to the Papal Nuncio and his colleagues in the Vatican Mission in Panama and to representatives of other countries that had nothing to do with the conflict.

Having voted for the resolution, we are duty bound, however, to draw attention to some of its elements on which we have misgivings.

First, operative paragraph 1

"Demands that Iraq permit and facilitate the immediate departure from Kuwait and Iraq of the nationals of third countries ...". (resolution 664 (1990), para. 1) In our informal consultations, references were made to

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

the national origins of these individuals, and figures were given. But we have not yet received an answer to the question we have asked from the very outset: What is to happen to the large number of nationals of Palestine who are in the territory of Kuwait? Is the Council asking that they be permitted and assisted to return to their lands, which, as the Council well knows, have been illegally occupied for so many years? Does the Council contemplate any action to ensure that the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians, which pre-date the conflict with which we are now dealing, are fulfilled? Perhaps we shall have to wait a while to get an answer to that question, which from a statistical point of view seems to be rather important, according to the data with which we have been provided.

The resolution welcomes

"the efforts of the Secretary-General to pursue urgent consultations with the Government of Iraq following the concern and anxiety expressed by ... the Council [yesterday]". (resolution 664 (1990), fourth preambular paragraph)

But we were rather hastily called upon to adopt this resolution that we have just adopted, when, clearly, the Secretary-General has had very little time to engage in these diplomatic efforts that we all want him to engage in.

In operative paragraph 2 the Council

"Further demands that Iraq take no action to jeopardize the safety, security or health of such nationals". (ibid, para. 2)

We believe that neither Iraq nor anyone else should take any measures that will affect or jeopardize the safety, security or health of these nationals or any other nationals in the area. It seems to us that this is a rather unilateral way of looking at the matter. Iraq is being asked to guarantee the health of foreign nationals on its territories, but we do not state in this resolution that the main

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

factor that could place at risk the ability of the nationals of third countries or the nationals of Kuwait and Iraq to get sufficient food or medicine is that, with the full knowledge of the Security Council, one Power, a permanent member of the Council, has abrogated to itself the power to decide what goes into or out of the territory of Kuwait and Iraq. The United States has not received any authorization from anyone to impede the arrival of food and medicine to Iraq. Despite the fact that resolution 661 (1990), of which the United States was a sponsor, clearly excludes medicine from the embargo or the sanctions and recognizes that there must be humanitarian considerations with regard to foodstuffs, and despite the fact that nowhere in that resolution is it stated that it is for the United States Government to determine when there are humanitarian circumstances and when there are not, we have now been informed unilaterally that from now on Washington will not take such requirements into account, and such products will not enter the area in question.

Hence, if the Security Council wishes to be the least bit objective, it should demand that the United States Government put an immediate end to its illegal activities - not authorized by anyone - in the region, activities that are affecting the security and health of the nationals of various countries, including the nationals of Iraq and Kuwait.

There have been other developments in recent days which, unfortunately, have not yet prompted the Security Council to take any action. Originally we were convened to consider the imposition of sanctions against Iraq - when we all knew that such sanctions had already been applied by some developed countries. The Council adopted resolution 661 (1990) and immediately - without any request from any quarter, without any authorization from anywhere - the United States Government sent its navy, its air force, its soldiers to the region and began to guarantee the

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

implementation of the resolution. That constitutes, inter alia, not only a violation of the Charter but a violation of resolution 661 (1990) itself. And yet it is a resolution that the United States Government is very much in favour of.

Subsequently, a de facto naval blockade was put into place. And barely 48 hours ago something rather strange happened: the members of the Council became aware of a communication dated 16 August 1990 and sent by Ambassador Watson, at that time acting as head of the United States Mission. That communication informed us that the United States was applying blockade measures and alleged that it was doing so under Article 51 of the Charter and Security Council resolution 661 (1990). I have already said that nowhere does that resolution authorize anyone or ask anyone - the United States or any other State - to implement the resolution by military means.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

Article 51 is undoubtedly known to any "first-grader" in the United Nations system. It refers to a very old principle of mankind - the right to self-defence. But it is also crystal clear in recognizing the right to self-defence

"until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security".

What we are witnessing now is a new and interesting phenomenon, which should prompt the Council to take very clear decisions.

The Charter is being amended. We see a twisting of the terms of the original concept of the Charter with regard to self-defence: the Charter is being used, deceitfully, as something to be implemented unilaterally by one State after the Security Council has taken the decisions it deems appropriate. Does that mean that the United States is not really in agreement with resolution 661 (1990), which it promoted? Does it believe that the Security Council has not taken the steps it should? Or, contrary to Article 51, does it feel that it has the right to infringe the authority and responsibility of the Security Council?

It has been alleged on other occasions, because the United States delegation has used a variety of arguments, that the United States is implementing resolution 661 (1990), which clearly is based on Article 41 of the Charter, and that Article could not be clearer either. It refers to measures "not involving the use of armed force". We believe that the Council will lose some of its credibility and moral authority if it refers to only some aspects of the complex and serious conflict with which we are dealing on the basis of a decision which may be taken by a permanent member which then decides when we should be convened, for what purpose and to discuss which part of a given conflict, in order to take a speedy decision on the matter.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

So far the Security Council has been unable to act in a situation which is extremely clear, where one of its members is using the resolutions of the Security Council in the manner it deems most suitable to protect its own interests.

I have before me the text of an important statement, a message from a distinguished Arab leader, President Ben Ali of the Republic of Tunisia, to his people a few days ago. I shall read out part of the message, as follows:

"The situation makes us wonder with bitterness about the proper foundation of the pretext of international legality to send foreign troops to Arab soil. We have tested this legality through the now chronic Palestinian matter, the occupation of Arab territories, the invasion of Lebanon and the repression of the intifadah, despite the many resolutions adopted by the United Nations and the successive votes against those who are clamouring for their legitimate rights.

"Events have demonstrated that legality and the principles which should back it up are not adequate in the face of the vital interests of the major Powers, and that this legality changes depending on those interests and their relations with the party to be condemned."

In expressing our agreement with that statement made by the President of the Republic of Tunisia, we should like once again to call the Council's attention to the need to take measures that will really make it possible to resolve the conflict peacefully. At the very least we should make sure that the Council's resolutions or decisions are implemented in the manner in which the Council itself decides.

My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution because of the humanitarian considerations, which we consider to be legitimate. Some of our colleagues have explained their concerns with regard to their own nationals in the region. We also did so because we believe that it might, if the Council's

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

authority is respected, help ensure that this element is not used as one more excuse - not to seek peace, but to continue along the course of war and military intervention.

The representative of the United States concluded his statement by saying something which may be quite normal, but which at the same time could be a terrible threat. He said that the United States was not only supporting the draft resolution, but would seek its full implementation. I am not quoting exactly, because the United States delegation did not circulate the text of the statement. Earlier, saying that it sought full implementation of sanctions, the United States sent the fleet and deployed major military units, which continue to grow in the area. Now will the United States also implement this resolution by using force? Will it use the resolution to take unilateral measures, or will United States action be kept strictly within the parameters of this resolution, adopted unanimously? We shall wait and see.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): For a resolution for which he voted, the representative of Cuba spent a long time telling us about all the portions of it which he disliked. I wish to respond to only one issue that he raised - the application of Article 51 of the Charter.

I shall be brief; I shall read from a document I recently submitted to the Council, document S/21492, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

> "As I informed you yesterday, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, I wish on behalf of my Government, to report that the United States has deployed military forces to the Persian Gulf region. These forces have been dispatched in exercise of the inherent right of individual and collective self-defence, recognized in Article 51, in response to developments and requests from Governments in the region,

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

including requests from Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, for assistance. The application of this inherent right in response to the Iraqi armed attack on Kuwait has been affirmed in resolution 661 (1990)."

I should like now to turn to a second document, resolution 661 (1990) and to read out the penultimate preambular paragraph, as follows:

"Affirming the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence, in response to the armed attack by Iraq against Kuwait, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter".

I believe that that makes sufficiently clear the position of my Government in this regard.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Far be it from me at this stage to embark upon a legal discussion, but we still have the same concern - whether Article 51 can be construed to allow, on the decision of any Member State, actions which have not been agreed upon by the Security Council, including the use of armed force, and whether resolution 661 (1990) can be construed as allowing the United States to use military means for an unauthorized purpose. I think we are right to express our profound concern that the United States will also try to promote the full implementation of the resolution we have just adopted by taking aggressive military action, including the use of warships and bombers.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

I think what is most important about the article and resolution from which he has quoted is that both assert this Council's authority to handle the crisis. Here we have a delegation that comes here, as it frequently does, and calls upon us to take a decision so that the Council may act and then goes on to say it is acting as it must act, irrespective of decisions of the Council. Either one follows decisions of the Council or one does not.

We cannot accept having a member of the Council manipulate the Council's decisions according to its own interests.

The only special privilege of permanent members is the one unfortunately set forth in the Charter: the right of veto. But please: I think it would be a most serious matter for all Members of the Organization if we were to tolerate their using the Charter and the Council to do as they please.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of Romania.

The delegation of Romania associated itself with the expression of concern and anxiety voiced by the Security Council in connection with the situation of foreign nationals in Kuwait and Iraq. In this respect my delegation shares the views of other members of the Council concerning the necessity of the Iraqi Government's abiding by the obligations assumed under the relevant international legal instruments. Thus, article 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966 clearly states that everyone lawfully within the territory of a State shall within that territory have the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose his residence. Moreover, in conformity with the same article everyone shall be free to leave any country including his own.

Mention could also be made of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949. That Convention binds the

(The President)

authorities of any party to the conflict. Section 2 of the Convention is devoted to the situation of aliens in the territory of a party to a conflict. Article 35 of the Convention deals specifically with the right to leave the territory. It states that all protected persons who may desire to leave the territory at the outset of or during a conflict shall be entitled to do so.

We think that any action undertaken by the Security Council on this sensitive issue could contribute to decrease the tension in the region, and therefore my delegation fully supports its draft resolution in document S/21562 and the efforts of the Secretary-General on the present item.

Finally we reiterate our conviction that under the given circumstances it is necessary for all States to display moderation and responsibility and to undertake nothing which may further aggravate the situation.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

The Council will now hear other statements. I call on the representative of Kuwait.

Mr. AL-SALLAL (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): We have convened today for the fourth time in two weeks to grapple with the evil that was unleashed on the second of this month with the aim of destroying an oasis of safety and a haven of stability and security in the region, spreading among citizens and residents murder, terrorist acts and oppression. The intolerable situation there impels thousands of foreigners to seek to flee.

The essence of this issue is the barbaric aggression perpetrated by the Iraqi régime against my country. It has trampled upon all the norms and principles of international law. Each day that passes reveals another black chapter in the bleak record of that régime in Kuwait, replete with crimes against the people, proving to the whole world that there is no end to its flouting of world peace and security and humanity as a whole.

(Mr. Al-Sallal, Kuwait)

The resolution the Council has adopted grapples with a political, legal and humanitarian issue unprecedented in the history of the international community in which millions of citizens are being held hostage to aggressive, expansionist policies that threaten world peace and security, compromising the interests of all the countries of the world.

At a time when Iraq is calling for the easing of sanctions for humanitarian reasons, it threatens to deprive foreigners in Iraq of food. This is hideous blackmail. The attitude of the Iraqi régime towards innocent, defenceless citizens and its threats to use them as a human shield to protect the aggressive military institutions of Iraq represents human behaviour at its basest and requires that the international community respond resolutely and unhesitatingly to stop the aggressor.

The international community must take more stringent measures to stop that régime's madness and to end its trampling upon and riding roughshod over the norms of the international community. Delay, shortsightedness and preoccupation with temporary interests will wreak havoc all over the world, to an extent that is unpredictable at this stage. Therefore we fully support the efforts of the Secretary-General aimed at finding a satisfactory solution for the problem of the detainees. We hope that the representatives of the International Red Cross will be able to get permission to enter Kuwait from the occupying authorities, which at present, in contravention of the Geneva Convention, are preventing them from doing so. Iraq is trying to cover up the crimes perpetrated there.

The resolution just adopted by the Council also calls on Iraq to refrain from changing the legal status of the consular offices there, based on resolution 662 (1990), which stated that the annexation of Iraq is null and void.

(Mr. Al-Sallal, Kuwait)

Any attempt on the part of the Iraqi régime to change the constitutional and legal status of Kuwait and to continue the destruction of its economy as well as of the social fibre of its citizens, demands the fullest condemnation by the Security Council and by all States of the world, rejecting the decisions issued by the occupation by Iraqi troops there that call for closing the consular offices in Kuwait. Resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990) and 664 (1990) are all binding, and we must respect their provisions. International legality must be maintained.

The whole world is looking to the Security Council. Its responsibility is tremendous, commensurate with the risks confronting us. Thus, it is imperative to close ranks, to co-operate, to take joint action to protect the present and pave the way for a world that seeks to be free from aggression and from aggressors, a world in which relations between peoples and States will be based on justice, peace and mutual respect.

What has been described by one member just a few moments ago as "an Iraqi initiative" is no more than a simple-minded and flimsy device aimed at distracting world attention and preventing decisive action to implement resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990) and 662 (1990), which call for the immediate and complete withdrawal of the invading aggressor troops of Iraq from Kuwait and for the return of the legitimate authority, namely, the Sheikh Jabir Al-Ahmad Al-Jabir Al-Sabah.

The state of tension that now prevails in the Gulf region is a direct result of Iraq's aggressive actions against the sovereignty, security and territorial integrity of Kuwait. The so-called initiative is no more than a continuation of the Iraqi authorities' mind-set against foreign nationals in Kuwait and Iraq, that is, simply the mentality of detaining hostages there.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Iraq.

Mr. AL ANBARI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): First of all, I wish to draw the Security Council's attention to the position adopted by the United States concerning resolution 660 (1990), and to its special interpretation of how that resolution is to be implemented.

The United States has arrogated to itself the right to impose a maritime blockade against Iraq without calling it by that name. The United States Secretary of State announced on 10 August 1990 at a meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) held at Brussels that the United States had the right to resort to the use of force in order to prevent any commercial relations between third-party countries and Iraq. The United Kingdom followed the example of the United States and announced on 13 August 1990 that the United Kingdom would use its warships to prevent what it called any violation of the sanctions adopted in accordance with resolution 661 (1990).

Despite the speed with which that resolution was adopted and the pressures exerted for its adoption, and despite the flagrant injustice of its provisions, we note that the United States of America and its ally the United Kingdom are attempting, by taking the position I have just mentioned, to impose a certain interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. That position is based on the allegation that that Article allows the natural right of individual or collective self-defence and that resolution 661 (1990) refers to that Article. Those two States have declared that they had been given the right to make use of that right on behalf of what they called the legitimate Government of Kuwait; they claim that this entitles them to implement resolution 661 (1990).

As members know, Article 51 grants the right of individual or collective self-defence "until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security". The Security Council took such measures by its

(Mr. Al Anbari, Iraq)

hasty and unjust resolution 661 (1990) requesting all States to respect that Article, and it established a Committee in order to guarantee the implementation of the resolution.

It is clear from this that the position of the United States of America and the United Kingdom is based on a totally fallacious pretext: the interpretation envisaged by them is only a partial interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

By their positions, to which I have referred, the United States and the United Kingdom have transformed the way in which the unjust resolution 661 (1990) is to be implemented. Rather than inviting States to implement the sanctions as those States understand them, the United States and the United Kingdom would have States implement the resolution as those two countries understand them. Thus, the machinery for implementing the unjust provisions of the resolution is no longer the invitation to States to implement sanctions as they interpret them, under the supervision of a committee established by the Council to that end. The United States and the United Kingdom have transformed that machinery into a military blockade by force of arms.

By adopting that dangerous position, the United States and the United Kingdom have appointed themselves the policemen of the region, acting in the name of the Security Council, under the cover of the United Nations, even though the Security Council and the Charter of the United Nations do not grant them that right.

Iraq vigorously protests against that conduct by the United States of America and the United Kingdom and believes that it constitutes aggression against Iraq. Iraq will do everything in its power to counter that aggression and to prevent it from being imposed on the world and on the United Nations.

Worse still, the United States and its allies have continued their acts of aggression in contravention of international law and of the letter and spirit of resolution 661 (1990) concerning the embargo, which made an explicit exception in respect of food and medicine. That resolution gives no party the right to resort to the use of force, to encircle Iraqi ports or to intercept Iraqi ships on the high seas.

Despite this, and in contravention of the international will - which a few weeks ago attempted to protect Palestinian Arabs in Kuwait - the United States has

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

resorted to the veto to undermine that international will. Today, the United States is using pretexts to defy the resolutions of the Security Council, and it is declaring to the entire world that it will resort to force to prevent the delivery of food and medicine to Iraq.

The United States is not concerned in the least about the suffering this will impose on the Iraqi people and on Arab and foreign nationals residing in Kuwait City and in other Iraqi cities. While stressing the importance of ensuring the safety and well-being of all foreign nationals residing in Iraq, Iraq believes that their departure depends on the cessation of armed acts of aggression by the United States and the United Kingdom and on the cessation of terrorist acts. It also depends on the unhindered delivery of food and medicine to Iraq and on the provision of genuine guarantees in that regard.

I wish further to say that Iraq will not prevent foreign nationals from obtaining food and medicine. It will share with foreign nationals whatever food and medicine enter the country. We guarantee the elderly, children and others of foreign nationality full medical care on an equal footing with Iraqi citizens.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

Foreign and Arab nationals residing in all of Iraq's cities are not hostages in Iraq. However, the Iraqi people as a whole is the hostage of American terrorism and is the victim of the food and medicine blockade, which runs counter to the most fundamental principles of international law and to the resolutions of the Security Council.

In conclusion, Iraq will take no measure other than defending itself if the United States or one of its allies should attack it. The security and safety of foreign nationals is guaranteed if the United States and its allies guarantee that they will not attack Iraq. However, if the United States of America and its allies should persist in their policy of aggression and attack Iraq with their military forces - meaning, of course, the military forces of the United States - making Iraqi women, children and old men victims, then whatever the Iraqi people would be subjected to would also be applied to its foreign guests. The responsibility would rest with the aggressors and their allies, their accomplices. That is why we fear that the resolution adopted by the Security Council this evening, instead of guaranteeing the safety of foreign nationals in the region, will be a new pretext for further aggression by the United States against Iraq.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): The hour is late and I have just a few points to make on the amazing discourse to which we have just been treated.

The discomfort of my colleague from Iraq is obvious, because he has clearly once again been given an opportunity to provide us with Iraqi public relations. Indeed, over the last three or four weeks Iraqi public relations have been renowned for their ineptitude. In fact, what we have seen in the last few days, and what we have just heard, rank among the most difficult and unusual aspects of Iraqi public relations. Indeed, "Iraqi public relations" has probably become the oxymoron of the year here in New York.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

I shall make only a few comments on the words he spoke about the United States.

It is obvious that he believes that there is only one, or perhaps two, votes against him in the Council. He should re-examine the votes on the recent resolutions, where the Council has spoken with unanimity, and I hope that he and his Government will recognize, take heed of and listen to the views of the Council.

We also need no lessons from the representative of Iraq about interpreting the resolutions which we have adopted. His enthusiasm for interpreting them is a reflection, I think, of the attention he has been paying to what we have been saying, and of his own Government's willingness to heed what we have adopted here. Perhaps all this has somehow escaped their notice. Obviously we should like to have the representative of Iraq continue to pay close attention to what we are saying. Indeed, that he presumes to interpret our resolutions for us is the equivalent of the old English adage about setting the fox to watch the hen house.

We have also had the opportunity to hear Iraq's view about the United States provision of assistance under Article 51 of the Charter. I should be delighted, and indeed very interested, to hear Iraq's view of its own conduct in the light of Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter and resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990), 662 (1990) and today's resolution 664 (1990).

Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom): The hour is late and I shall be even briefer.

We have just heard an extraordinary, and I must say brazen, statement by the representative of Iraq which bore no relation to the concerns which have been expressed in this debate, on to the resolution which the Council has just adopted unanimously.

He has rejected, or appears to have rejected, the very strong message and signals that the Council has given him this evening. I hope very much that he and his Government will reflect carefully before they continue down that course.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Italy. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. TRAXLER (Italy): My delegation's request to participate in this meeting of the Security Council is the expression of the utmost concern with which my Government is following the deterioration of the political situation in the Gulf region resulting from the Iraqi aggression and subsequent annexation of Kuwait.

Italy has always unreservedly condemned the use of force by a Member State of the United Nations against the territorial integrity of another State as constituting a breach of the Charter of the United Nations and an unacceptable means of resolving international differences.

Consequently, Italy strongly rejects the act of aggression against Kuwait and regards the proclaimed annexation of Kuwait as null and void - as stated in Security Council resolution 662 (1990). Italy therefore rejects the Iraqi request for the closure of diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait and regards as unacceptable any attempt by the Iraqi authorities to exercise powers of government within the territory of Kuwait.

The behaviour of the Iraqi authorities is causing unacceptable hardship to foreigners in Iraq and in Kuwait. Italy, on a national basis and as the current President of the 12 States members of the European Community, has repeatedly voiced its deepest concern about the untenable situation of foreigners in both those countries.

(Mr. Traxler, Italy)

In this context, Italy wishes to express its utmost dismay at the unacceptable treatment meted out by the Iraqi authorities to Italian citizens who have gone to the two countries concerned in a spirit of friendship aimed at consolidating the relations of co-operation which have traditionally existed between Italy on the one hand and Iraq and Kuwait on the other. In view of the dramatic situation of its citizens in Iraq and Kuwait, Italy requests the Iraqi authorities, whom we hold fully accountable for the safety of foreign citizens, to permit and facilitate their immediate departure from Iraq and Kuwait and to grant them continuing access to their consular officials.

Italy further demands that the Iraqi authorities take no action to jeopardize the safety, security or health of our citizens. In this context, we should like to remind Iraq of its obligations under the international conventions it has ratified, in particular - and it has been quoted by others before me - the Fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949, as well as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

In this same context, we hope that the prompt action undertaken by the Secretary-General will be successful. In fact, while expressing our sincere appreciation to the Secretary-General for the prompt way in which he has responded to the anxieties expressed by a number of countries, we shall continue to follow the situation of our citizens in Iraq and Kuwait with the utmost attention and concern.

We sincerely hope that the Iraqi authorities will abide by the fundamental provisions of the aforementioned international treaties and that they will allow all foreigners in Iraq and Kuwait full and unconditional freedom of movement within and outside those countries, thus demonstrating their willingness to search for a political solution to the crisis.

(Mr. Traxler, Italy)

For its part, Italy, while fully supporting the implementation of Security Council resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990) and 662 (1990) and today's resolution, 664 (1990), reiterates its deep commitment to contribute to the prompt achievement of such a political solution by peaceful means. Indeed, we hope that the adoption by the Council of today's resolution may constitute a first step in that direction.

The PRESIDENT: There are no further names on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 12.35 a.m., Sunday, 19 August 1990.